

Additional Institutional Investors

- **The Dot.Com Fund.**
- **Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.**
- **Standard Life Investments.**

PROMINENT CASES

PROMINENT CASES PROSECUTED BY LERACH COUGHLIN ATTORNEYS

- ***In re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litig.***, MDL 1023 (S.D.N.Y.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as court-appointed co-lead counsel for a class of investors. The class alleged that the NASDAQ market-makers set and maintained wide spreads pursuant to an industry wide conspiracy in one of the largest and most important antitrust cases in recent history. After three and one half years of intense litigation, the case was settled for a total of \$1.027 billion, the largest antitrust settlement ever. An excerpt from the court's opinion reads:

Counsel for the Plaintiffs are preeminent in the field of class action litigation, and the roster of counsel for the Defendants includes some of the largest, most successful and well regarded law firms in the country. It is difficult to conceive of better representation than the parties to this action achieved.

- ***In re American Continental Corp./Lincoln Savings & Loan Sec. Litig.***, MDL 834 (D. Ariz.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as the court-appointed co-lead counsel for a class of persons who purchased debentures and/or stock in American Continental Corp., the parent company of the now infamous Lincoln Savings & Loan. The suit charged Charles Keating, other insiders, three major accounting firms, three major law firms, Drexel Burnham, Michael Milken and others with racketeering and violations of securities laws. Recoveries totaled \$240 million on \$288 million in losses. A jury also rendered verdicts of more than \$1 billion against Keating and others.

- ***In re 3Com, Inc. Sec. Litig.***, No. C-97-21083-JW (N.D. Cal.). A hard-fought class action alleging violations of the federal securities law violations in which Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel for the class and obtained a recovery totaling \$259 million.

- ***Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.***, No. 939359 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Francisco County). In this case R.J. Reynolds admitted "the *Mangini* action, and the way that it was vigorously litigated, was an early, significant and unique driver of the overall legal and social controversy regarding underage smoking that led to the decision to phase out the Joe Camel Campaign."

- ***Cordova v. Liggett Group, Inc., et al.***, No. 651824 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego County), and ***People v. Philip Morris, Inc., et al.***, No. 980864 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Francisco County). Lerach Coughlin attorneys, as lead counsel in both these actions, played a key role in these cases which were settled with the attorneys general global agreement with the tobacco industry bringing \$26 billion to the State of California as a whole and \$12.5 billion to the cities and counties within California.

- ***Does I, et al. v. The Gap, Inc., et al.***, No. 01 0031 (D. Northern Mariana Islands). In this groundbreaking case, Lerach Coughlin attorneys represented a class of 30,000 garment workers who alleged that they had worked under sweatshop conditions in garment factories in Saipan that produced clothing for top U.S. retailers such as The Gap, Target and J.C. Penney. In the first action of its kind, Lerach Coughlin attorneys pursued claims against the factories and the retailers alleging violations of RICO, the Alien Tort

Claims Act and the Law of Nations based on the alleged systemic labor and human rights abuses occurring in Saipan. This case was a companion to two other actions: *Does I, et al. v. Advance Textile Corp., et al.*, No. 99 0002 (D. Northern Mariana Islands) – which alleged overtime violations by the garment factories under the Fair Labor Standards Act– and *UNITE, et al. v. The Gap, Inc., et al.*, No. 300474 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Francisco County), which alleged violations of California’s Unfair Practices Law by the U.S. retailers. These actions resulted in a settlement of approximately \$20 million that included a comprehensive Monitoring Program to address past violations by the factories and prevent future ones. The members of the litigation team were honored as Trial Lawyers of the Year by the Trial Lawyers for Public Justice in recognition of the team’s efforts at bringing about the precedent-setting settlement of the actions.

- *In re Exxon Valdez*, No. A89 095 Civ. (D. Alaska), and *In re Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Litig.*, 3 AN 89 2533 (Alaska Super. Ct., 3d Jud. Dist.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served on the Plaintiffs’ Coordinating Committee and Plaintiffs’ Law Committee in the massive litigation resulting from the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska in March 1989. A jury verdict of \$5 billion was obtained and is currently on appeal.

- *In re Washington Public Power Supply Sys. Sec. Litig.*, MDL 551 (D. Ariz.). A massive litigation in which Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel for a class that obtained recoveries totaling \$775 million after several months of trial.

- *Hall v. NCAA* (Restricted Earnings Coach Antitrust Litigation), No. 94-2392-KHV (D. Kan.). The firm was lead counsel and lead trial counsel for one of three classes of coaches in consolidated price fixing actions against the National Collegiate Athletic Association. On May 4, 1998, the jury returned verdicts in favor of the three classes for more than \$54.5 million.

- *Newman v. Stringfellow* (Stringfellow Dump Site Litigation), No. 165994 MF (Cal. Super. Ct., Riverside County). Lerach Coughlin attorneys represented more than 4,000 individuals suing for personal injury and property damage arising from their claims that contact with the Stringfellow Dump Site may have caused them toxic poisoning. Recovery totaled approximately \$109 million.

- *In re Prison Realty Sec. Litig.*, No. 3:99-0452 (M.D. Tenn.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel for the class obtaining a \$105 million recovery.

- *City of San Jose v. PaineWebber*, No. C-84-20601(RFP) (N.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys filed a lawsuit on behalf of the City of San Jose to recover speculative trading losses from its former auditors and 13 brokerage firms. In June 1990, following a six-month trial, the jury returned a verdict for the City, awarding over \$18 million in damages plus pre-judgment interest. The City also recovered an additional \$12 million in settlements prior to and during the trial.

- *Hicks v. Nationwide*, No. 602469 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego County). Lerach Coughlin attorneys represented a class of consumers alleging fraud involving military purchasers of life insurance, in which a jury trial resulted in a full recovery for the class, plus punitive damages.

- ***In re Nat'l Health Laboratories Sec. Litig.***, No. CV-92-1949-RBB (S.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and obtained a pretrial recovery of \$64 million in this securities fraud class action.
- ***In re Informix Corp. Sec. Litig.***, No. C-97-1289-CRB (N.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel for the class and obtained a recovery of \$137.5 million.
- ***In re Apple Computer Sec. Litig.***, No. C-84-20148(A)-JW (N.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel and after several years of litigation obtained a \$100 million jury verdict in this securities fraud class action. The \$100 million jury verdict was later upset on post-trial motions, but the case was settled favorably to the class.
- ***In re Nat'l Medical Enterprises Sec. Litig.***, No. CV-91-5452-TJH (C.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and recovered \$60.75 million in this securities fraud class action.
- ***In re Nucorp Energy Sec. Litig.***, MDL 514 (S.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this consolidated class action and recovered \$55 million.
- ***In re U.S. Financial Sec. Litig.***, MDL 161 (S.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys acted as chairman of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee and achieved a pretrial recovery of over \$50 million.
- ***Barr v. United Methodist Church***, No. 404611 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego County). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead and trial counsel in this class action on behalf of elderly persons who lost their life savings when a church-sponsored retirement home that had sold them prepaid life-care contracts went bankrupt. After four years of intensive litigation—three trips to the U.S. Supreme Court and five months of trial—plaintiffs obtained a settlement providing over \$40 million in benefits to the class members. In approving that settlement, Judge James Foucht praised the result as “a most extraordinary accomplishment” and noted that it was the “product of the skill, effort and determination of plaintiffs’ counsel.”
- ***Grobow v. Dingman*** (The Henley Group Litigation), No. 575076 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego County). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and obtained \$42 million derivatively on behalf of The Henley Group, Inc.
- ***In re Intel Sec. Litig.***, No. C-79-2168A-RPA (N.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this securities class action that recovered \$40 million.
- ***In re Financial Corp. of America***, No. CV-84-6050-TJH(Bx) (C.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and obtained a recovery of \$41 million.
- ***In re Oak Industries Sec. Litig.***, No. 83-0537-G(M) (S.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this case and obtained a recovery of \$33 million.
- ***In re Wickes Cos. Sec. Litig.***, MDL 513 (S.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as liaison counsel in this consolidated securities law class action that recovered \$32 million.

- ***Weinberger v. Shumway*** (The Signal Companies, Inc.), No. 547586 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego County). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this derivative litigation challenging executive “golden parachute” contracts, and obtained a recovery of approximately \$23 million.
- ***In re Seafirst Sec. Litig.***, No. C-83-771-R (W.D. Wash.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this class action and obtained a pretrial recovery of \$13.6 million.
- ***In re Waste Management Sec. Litig.***, No. 83-C2167 (N.D. Ill.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this case and obtained a pretrial recovery of \$11.5 million.
- ***In re IDB Communications Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.***, No. CV-94-3618 (C.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this case and obtained a pretrial recovery of \$75 million.
- ***In re Boeing Sec. Litig.***, No. C97-1715Z (W.D. Wash.). A securities class action in which Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel for the class obtaining a recovery in the amount of \$92.5 million.
- ***Thurber v. Mattel, Inc., et al.***, No. CV-99-10368-MRP (C.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as chair of the Executive Committee of Plaintiffs’ Counsel and obtained a recovery of \$122 million.
- ***In re Dollar General Sec. Litig.***, No. 3:01-0388 (M.D. Tenn.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and obtained a recovery of \$172.5 million.
- ***Pirelli Armstrong Tire Corp. Retiree Medical Benefits Trust v. Hanover Compressor Co.***, No. H02-0410 (S.D. Tex.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel and obtained a recovery of \$85 million.
- ***In re Reliance Acceptance Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.***, MDL 1304 (D. Del.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and obtained a recovery of \$39 million.
- ***Schwartz v. Visa Int’l, et al.***, No. 822404-4 (Cal. Super. Ct., Alameda County). After years of litigation and a six month trial, Lerach Coughlin attorneys won one of the largest consumer protection verdicts ever awarded in the United States. Lerach Coughlin attorneys represented California consumers who sued Visa and MasterCard for intentionally imposing and concealing a fee from their cardholders. The court ordered Visa and MasterCard to return \$800,000,000 in cardholder losses, which represented 100% of the amount illegally taken, plus 2% interest. In addition, the court ordered full disclosure of the hidden fee.
- ***Morris v. Lifescan, Inc.***, No. CV-98-20321-JF (N.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys were responsible for achieving a \$45 million all-cash settlement with Johnson & Johnson and its wholly-owned subsidiary, Lifescan, Inc., over claims that Lifescan deceptively marketed and sold a defective blood-glucose monitoring system for diabetics. The Lifescan settlement was noted by the district court for the Northern District of California as providing “exceptional results” for members of the class.

- ***Thompson v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.***, 216 F.R.D. 55 (S.D.N.Y. 2003). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel and obtained \$145 million for the class in a settlement involving racial discrimination claims in the sale of life insurance.

- ***In re: The Prudential Insurance Company of America Sales Practices Litigation***, 962 F. Supp. 450 (D. N.J. 1997). In one of the first cases of its kind, Lerach Coughlin attorneys obtained a settlement of over \$1.2 billion for deceptive sales practices in connection with the sale of life insurance involving the “vanishing premium” sales scheme.

PRECEDENT-SETTING DECISIONS

Lerach Coughlin attorneys are consistent leaders in developing favorable law for defrauded investors under state and federal securities laws. Lerach Coughlin attorneys have represented individual and institutional plaintiffs in over 500 securities class actions, including many under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. In most of those cases, Lerach Coughlin has been appointed as lead or co-lead counsel by the Court. Lerach Coughlin has also been at the forefront of shareholder rights in derivative and Mergers and Acquisitions litigation. Additionally, Lerach Coughlin attorneys are involved in complex litigation in such varied areas as abuses in the insurance industry, consumer protection and antitrust litigation, civil and human rights, and tobacco litigation. The firm's lawyers have been responsible for establishing many important precedents, including:

Investor and Shareholder Rights

- ***No. 84 Employer-Teamster Joint Council Pension Trust Fund v. America West Holding Corp.***, 320 F.3d 920 (9th Cir. 2003). *America West* is a landmark Ninth Circuit decision holding that investors pleaded with particularity facts raising a strong inference of corporate defendants' fraudulent intent under heightened pleading standards of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995.

- ***Pirraglia v. Novell, Inc.***, 339 F.3d 1182 (10th Cir. 2003). In *Pirraglia*, the Tenth Circuit upheld investors' accounting-fraud claims, concluding that their complaint presented with particularity facts raising a strong inference of the defendants' fraudulent intent.

- ***Broudo v. Dura Pharmaceuticals, Inc.***, 339 F.3d 933 (9th Cir. 2003). The Ninth Circuit upheld investors' securities-fraud claims, reaffirming Ninth Circuit law on loss causation, which holds that investors suffer a loss when they purchase securities at a price inflated by fraud.

- ***In re Cavanaugh***, 306 F.3d 726 (9th Cir. 2002). In *Cavanaugh*, the Ninth Circuit disallowed judicial auctions to select lead plaintiffs in securities class actions, and protected lead

plaintiffs' right to select the lead counsel they desire to represent them.

- ***Lone Star Ladies Investment Club v. Schlotzsky's, Inc.***, 238 F.3d 363 (5th Cir. 2001). In *Lone Star Ladies*, the Fifth Circuit upheld investors' claims that securities-offering documents were incomplete and misleading, reversing a district court order that had applied inappropriate pleading standards to dismiss the case.

- ***Bryant v. Dupree***, 252 F.3d 1161 (11th Cir. 2001). The Eleventh Circuit held that investors were entitled to amend their securities-fraud complaint to reflect further developments in the case, reversing a contrary district court order.

- ***Bryant v. Avado Brands***, 187 F.3d 1271 (11th Cir. 1999). Interpreting the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, the Eleventh Circuit held that its provision requiring investors to plead facts raising a strong inference of scienter does not abrogate the principle that recklessness suffices to establish liability for violations of §10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

- ***Berry v. Valence Tech., Inc.***, 175 F.3d 699 (9th Cir. 1999). The Ninth Circuit held that negative articles in the financial press do not cause the one-year "inquiry notice" statute of

limitations to run, and indicated possible acceptance of an “actual knowledge” standard that would greatly extend the statute of limitations for victims of securities fraud.

- ***Hertzberg v. Dignity Partners, Inc.***, 191 F.3d 1076 (9th Cir. 1999). The Ninth Circuit reversed dismissal of investors’ claims that securities-offering documents were misleading, holding purchasers who bought shares in the aftermarket had standing to bring claims under the Securities Act of 1933 where a material fact is misstated or omitted from a registration statement.

- ***StorMedia, Inc. v. Superior Court***, 20 Cal. 4th 449 (1999). Interpreting the anti-manipulation provisions of California’s state securities laws, the California Supreme Court held that a corporation engages in the offer or sale of securities when it maintains an employee stock-option or stock-purchase plan, and thus may be liable under the statute for disseminating false or misleading public statements.

- ***Diamond Multimedia Sys., Inc. v. Superior Court***, 19 Cal. 4th 1036 (1999). The California Supreme Court held that the California state securities laws’ broad anti-manipulation provisions provide a remedy for out-of-state investors damaged by manipulative acts committed within the State of California.

- ***Cooper v. Pickett***, 137 F.3d 616 (9th Cir. 1998). *Cooper* is the leading Ninth Circuit precedent on pleading accounting fraud with particularity. The court held that plaintiffs stated claims against a company, its independent auditors, and its underwriters, for engaging in a scheme to defraud involving improper revenue recognition.

- ***McGann v. Ernst & Young***, 102 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996). *McGann* is a leading federal

appellate precedent interpreting Securities Exchange Act of 1934 §10(b)’s provision prohibiting manipulative or deceptive conduct “in connection with” the purchase or sale of a security. The court rejected contentions that auditors could not be liable for a recklessly misleading audit opinion if they directly participated in no securities transactions. Rather, an accounting firm is subject to liability if it prepares a fraudulent audit report knowing that its client will include the report in an SEC filing.

- ***Provenz v. Miller***, 102 F.3d 1478 (9th Cir. 1996). In *Provenz*, the Ninth Circuit reversed a district court’s entry of summary judgment for defendants in an accounting-fraud case. The decision is a leading federal appellate precedent on the evidence required to prove fraudulent revenue recognition.

- ***Knapp v. Ernst & Whinney***, 90 F.3d 1431 (9th Cir. 1996). The Ninth Circuit affirmed a jury verdict entered for stock purchasers against a major accounting firm.

- ***Warshaw v. Xoma Corp.***, 74 F.3d 955 (9th Cir. 1996). *Warshaw* is a leading federal appellate precedent on pleading falsity in securities class actions – sustaining allegations that a pharmaceutical company misled securities analysts and investors regarding the efficacy of a new drug and the likelihood of FDA approval. The court also held that a company may be liable to investors if it misled securities analysts.

- ***Gohler v. Wood***, 919 P.2d 561 (Utah 1996). The Utah Supreme Court held that investors need not plead or prove “reliance” on false or misleading statements in order to recover under a state law prohibiting misleading statements in connection with the sale of a security.

- ***Fecht v. Price Co.***, 70 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 1995). *Fecht* is another leading precedent on

pleading falsity with particularity. It sustained allegations that a retail chain's positive portrayal of its expansion program was misleading in light of undisclosed problems that caused the program to be curtailed. The Ninth Circuit held that investors may draw on contemporaneous conditions – such as disappointing results and losses in new stores – to explain why a company's optimistic statements were false and misleading. It also clarified the narrow scope of the so-called "bespeaks caution" defense.

- *In re Software Toolworks Sec. Litig.*, 50 F.3d 615 (9th Cir. 1995). In *Software Toolworks*, the Ninth Circuit reversed the summary judgment entered for defendants, including a company and its top insiders, independent auditors, and underwriters. Among other things, the court held that auditors and underwriters could be liable for their role in drafting a misleading letter sent to the SEC on the corporate defendant's attorneys' letterhead.

- *In re Pacific Enterprises Sec. Litig.*, 47 F.3d 373 (9th Cir. 1995). The Ninth Circuit approved shareholders' settlement of a derivative suit as fair, reasonable, and adequate.

- *Kaplan v. Rose*, 49 F.3d 1363 (9th Cir. 1994). The court reversed entry of summary judgment for defendants because investors presented sufficient evidence for a jury to conclude that a medical device did not work as well as defendants claimed.

- *In re Wells Fargo Sec. Litig.*, 12 F.3d 922 (9th Cir. 1993). *Wells Fargo* is a leading federal appellate decision on pleading accounting fraud, sustaining investors' allegations that a bank misrepresented the adequacy of its loan-loss reserves.

- *Krangel v. General Dynamics Corp.*, 968 F.2d 914 (9th Cir. 1992). The Ninth Circuit

dismissed defendants' appeal from a district court's order upholding plaintiff investors' choice of forum by remanding the matter to the state court.

- *Colan v. Mesa Petroleum, Co.*, 951 F.2d 1512 (9th Cir. 1991). In a shareholder derivative action, the Ninth Circuit held that exchange of common stock for debt securities was a "sale" subject to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934's regulation of short-swing profits.

- *In re Apple Computer Sec. Litig.*, 886 F.2d 1109 (9th Cir. 1989). The Ninth Circuit reversed summary judgment for defendants, holding that investors could proceed to trial on claims that a company's representations about its new disk drive were misleading because they failed to disclose serious technical problems.

- *Blake v. Dierdorff*, 856 F.2d 1365 (9th Cir. 1988). The Ninth Circuit reversed a district court's dismissal of claims for fraud brought against a corporation's directors and its lawyers.

- *Mosesian v. Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.*, 727 F.2d 873 (9th Cir. 1984). The Ninth Circuit upheld an investor's right to pursue a class action against an accounting firm, adopting statute-of-limitation rules for §10(b) suits that are favorable to investors.

Insurance

- *Dehoyos v. Allstate Corp.*, 345 F.3d 290 (5th Cir. 2003), *cert. denied*, 2004 U.S. LEXIS 3088 (Apr. 26, 2004). The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals held that claims under federal civil rights statutes involving the sale of racially discriminatory insurance policies based upon the use of credit scoring, did not interfere with state insurance statutes or regulatory goals and were not preempted under the McCarran-Ferguson Act. Specifically, the appellate court affirmed the

district court's ruling that the McCarran-Ferguson Act does not preempt civil-rights claims – under the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the Fair Housing Act – for racially discriminatory business practices in the sale of automobile and homeowners insurance. The U.S. Supreme Court recently denied defendants' petition for certiorari and plaintiffs can now proceed with their challenge of defendants' allegedly discriminatory credit-scoring system used in pricing of automobile and homeowners insurance policies.

- *In re Monumental Life Insurance Co., Industrial Life Insurance Litigation*, ___ F.3d ___, 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 6392 (5th Cir. 2004). The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed a district court's denial of class certification in a case filed by African-Americans seeking to remedy racially-discriminatory insurance practices. The Fifth Circuit held that a monetary relief claim is viable in a Rule 23(b)(2) class if it flows directly from liability to the class as a whole and is capable of classwide "computation by means of objective standards and not dependent in any significant way on the intangible, subjective differences of each class member's circumstances."

- *Moore v. Liberty Nat'l Life Insurance Co.*

order certifying a class in an action by purchasers of so-called "vanishing premium" life-insurance policies who claimed violations of California's consumer-protection statutes. The court held common issues predominate where plaintiffs allege a uniform failure to disclose material information about policy dividend rates.

Consumer Protection

- *Kasky v. Nike, Inc.*, 27 Cal. 4th 939 (2002), cert. dismissed, 539 U.S. 654 (2003). The California Supreme Court upheld claims that an apparel manufacturer misled the public regarding its exploitative labor practices, thereby violating California statutes prohibiting unfair competition and false advertising. The court rejected defense contentions that such misconduct was protected by the First Amendment.

- *West Corp. v. Superior Court*, 116 Cal. App. 4th 1167 (2004). The California Court of Appeal upheld the trial court's finding that jurisdiction in California was appropriate over the out-of-state corporate defendant whose telemarketing was aimed at California residents. Exercise of jurisdiction was found to be in keeping with considerations of fair play and

also held that the claims were not preempted by the Federal Communications Act, that the California Public Utilities Commission does not have exclusive jurisdiction, that the doctrine of primary jurisdiction did not compel dismissal or stay of the action, and that the plaintiffs were not required to exhaust their administrative remedies.

- ***Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.***, 7 Cal. 4th 1057 (1994). The California Supreme Court upheld allegations that a cigarette manufacturer committed an unlawful business practice by targeting minors with its advertising. It flatly rejected the manufacturer's contention that the action was preempted by federal cigarette labeling laws.

- ***Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles***, 75 Cal. App. 4th 449 (1999). The California Court of Appeal invalidated a non-resident vehicle "smog impact" fee imposed on out-of-state autos being registered for the first time in California, finding that the fee violated the Interstate Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution.

- ***Clothesrigger, Inc. v. GTE Corp.***, 191 Cal. App. 3d 605 (1987). The California Court of Appeal reversed the trial court's decision refusing to apply California law to the claims of nonresident plaintiffs. In reversing the lower court's ruling, the court found that California law may constitutionally apply to the claims of proposed nationwide class members who are not residents of California, provided there are significant contacts to the claims asserted by each member.

- ***Lazar v. Hertz Corp.***, 143 Cal. App. 3d 128 (1983). The California Court of Appeal ordered a consumer class certified, in an opinion that significantly broadens the right of injured consumers to bring class actions.

- ***Barr v. United Methodist Church***, 90 Cal. App. 3d 259 (1979). The California Court of Appeal rejected constitutional defenses to an action for civil fraud and breach of contract committed by religiously affiliated defendants.

Antitrust

- ***Law v. NCAA***, 134 F.3d 1010 (10th Cir. 1998). The Tenth Circuit upheld summary judgment on liability for plaintiffs in college coaches' antitrust action against the National Collegiate Athletic Association on the issue of antitrust liability under Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. §1 (plaintiffs subsequently prevailed on a damages trial). It also upheld the district court's order permanently enjoining the NCAA from enforcing the "restricted earnings coach" rule, through which NCAA member institutions limited the salary of certain coaches to \$12,000 during the academic year.

- ***In re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litig.***, 172 F.R.D. 119 (S.D.N.Y. 1997). In a case where plaintiffs alleged that approximately 30 NASDAQ market-makers engaged in a conspiracy to restrain or eliminate price competition, the district court certified a class of millions of investors – including institutional investors to be represented by five public pension funds.

- ***In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litig.***, 170 F.R.D. 524 (M.D. Fla. 1996). Plaintiff contact lens purchasers alleged that defendant manufacturers conspired on a nationwide basis to eliminate competition and maintain artificially inflated prices for replacement contact lenses. The district court denied defendant manufacturers' motion to dismiss plaintiffs' Clayton Act claims and granted their motion for class certification, finding that plaintiffs' vertical-conspiracy evidence was general to the class and

provided a colorable method of proving impact on the class at trial.

- *In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litig.*, 265 F. Supp. 2d 385 (S.D.N.Y. 2003). In a case consolidating more than 20 putative class actions, plaintiff credit-card holders alleged that two credit-card networks, Visa and MasterCard, and their member banks, conspired to fix the foreign-currency conversion fees they charged. The district court found that plaintiffs pleaded facts sufficient to permit the inference of an antitrust conspiracy, denying defendants' motion to dismiss the antitrust allegations.

- *Pharmacare v. Caremark*, 965 F. Supp. 1411 (D. Haw. 1996). The district court denied defendant's motion to dismiss plaintiffs' Robinson-Patman Act claim in a case where the largest company in the alternate-site infusion therapy industry had pleaded guilty to mail fraud for making improper payments to physicians in exchange for their referrals of patients. Plaintiffs, defendant's competitors, alleged that they suffered injury as a result of defendant's agreements, which violated the anti-kickback provisions of the Clayton Act, §2(c) as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C. §13(c).

ADDITIONALLY, IN THE CONTEXT OF SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE ACTIONS, Lerach Coughlin attorneys has been at the forefront of protecting shareholders' investments by causing important changes in corporate governance as part of the global settlement of such cases. Three recent cases in which such changes were

THE FIRM'S PARTNERS

WILLIAM S. LERACH is widely recognized as one of the leading securities lawyers in the United States. He has headed the prosecution of hundreds of securities class and stockholder derivative actions resulting in recoveries for defrauded shareholders amounting to billions of dollars. Mr. Lerach has been the subject of considerable media attention and is a frequent commentator on securities and corporate law, as well as a frequent lecturer. He represents numerous public and multi-employer pension funds in corporate securities matters.

He is the author of *Plundering America: How American Investors Got Taken for Trillions by Corporate Insiders - The Rise of the New Corporate Kleptocracy*, 8 Stanford J. of Law, Bus. and Fin. 1 (2002); *Why Insiders Get Rich, and the Little Guy Loses*, L.A. Times, Jan. 20, 2002; *The Chickens Have Come Home to Roost: How Wall Street, the Big Accounting Firms and Corporate Interests Chloroformed Congress and Cost America's Investors Trillions; Achieving Corporate Governance Enhancements Through Litigation*, keynote address to Council of Institutional Investors spring meeting, Mar. 27, 2001; *The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 - 27 Months Later: Securities Class Action Litigation Under The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act's Brave New World*, Washington U. L. Rev., Vol. 76, No. 2 (1998); *An Alarming Decline In the Quality of Financial Reporting* (unpublished paper presented to 7th Annual BusinessWeek CFO Forum (June 1998); co author of *Civil RICO in Shareholders Suits Involving Defense Contractors* in Civil RICO Practice: Causes of Action, published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1991); *The Incorporation Trap: How Delaware Has Destroyed Corporate Governance* (unpublished paper presented to the Council of Institutional Investors (1990)); *Securities Class Actions and Derivative Litigations Involving Public*

Companies: A Plaintiff's Perspective, ALI/ABI, Civil Practice and Litigation in Federal and State Courts (1985), ABA Fall Meeting (1985) and PLI Securities Litigation, Prosecution and Defense Strategies (1985); *Alternative Approaches for Awarding Attorneys' Fees in Federal Court Litigation: It's Time to Unload the Lodestar* (unpublished paper presented to the Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference (1984)); *Class Action and Derivative Suits in the Aftermath of Control Contests, Mergers and Acquisitions: Choice of Forum and Remedies; Attorney/Client Privilege in Class and Derivative Cases*, ABA 1984 Annual Meeting (1984); *Class Actions: Plaintiffs' Perspectives, Tactics and Problems*, ALI/ABA, Civil Practice and Litigation in Federal and State Courts (1984); *Life After Huddleston: Streamlining and Simplification of the Securities Class Action*, 7 Class Action Reports 318 (1982). He is also the author of *Termination of Class Actions: The Judicial Role*, McGough & Lerach, 33 U. Pitt L. Rev. 446 (1972); *Class and Derivative Actions Under the Federal Securities Laws* (1980 Regents of the University of California).

Mr. Lerach is chief counsel in many of the largest and highest profile securities class action and corporate derivative suits in recent years, including *Enron*, *Dynegy*, *Qwest* and *WorldCom*. He is listed in the "Best Lawyers in America" and is a Master of the American Inns of Court. Mr. Lerach has been the President of the National Association of Securities and Commercial Lawyers (NASCAT), a national group of attorneys specializing in commercial and securities litigation. Mr. Lerach is a member of the Editorial Board of Class Action Reports, and frequently lectures on class and derivative actions, accountants' liability, and attorneys' fees, and has been a guest lecturer at Stanford University, University of California at Los Angeles and San Diego, University of Pittsburgh,

San Diego State University and at the Council of Institutional Investors and the International Corporate Governance Network. He is also a member of the American Law Institute faculty on Federal and State Class Action Litigation.

Mr. Lerach received his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Pittsburgh in 1967 and his law degree in 1970 where he graduated second in his class, *magna cum laude*, and was a member of the Order of the Coif. Mr. Lerach was admitted to the Pennsylvania Bar in 1970 and to the California Bar in 1976. Mr. Lerach was a partner with Pittsburgh firm Reed Smith Shaw & McClay before opening the West Coast office of Milberg Weiss in 1976. Mr. Lerach served as Co-Chairman of Milberg Weiss and serves as Chairman of Lerach Coughlin. He is a member of the Pennsylvania and California Bar Associations and has been admitted to practice before numerous federal and state courts. He is a member of the ABA Litigation Section's Committee on Class Actions and Derivative Skills.

Mr. Lerach has testified before federal and state legislative committees concerning corporate governance and securities matters and is frequently quoted in the national media regarding corporate issues.

Mr. Lerach was honored by President Clinton who appointed him to be a member of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council.

PATRICK J. COUGHLIN has been lead counsel for several major securities matters including one of the largest class action securities cases to go to trial, *In re Apple Computer Sec. Litig.*, No. C-84-20148(A)-JW (N.D. Cal.). Formerly, Mr. Coughlin was an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Washington, D.C. and San Diego handling complex white collar fraud matters. During this time Mr.

Coughlin helped try one of the largest criminal RICO cases ever prosecuted by the United States, *United States v. Brown, et al.*, 86-3056-SWR, as well as an infamous oil fraud scheme resulting in a complex murder-for-hire trial, *United States v. Boeckman, et al.*, 87-0676-K. Mr. Coughlin has instructed on the current state of securities class action litigation in light of U.S. Congressional action aimed at weakening U.S. securities laws.

While at Milberg Weiss, Mr. Coughlin handled a number of large securities cases involving such companies as IDB Communications Group (\$75 million recovery); Unocal (\$47.5 million recovery); Media Vision (\$25 million recovery); Boeing (\$92.5 million recovery); Sunrise Medical (\$20 million recovery); Sybase (\$28.5 million recovery); Conner Peripherals (\$26 million recovery); 3Com (\$259 million recovery). Mr. Coughlin also prosecuted a number of actions against the tobacco industry which resulted in the phase-out of the Joe Camel Campaign and a \$12.5 billion recovery to the Cities and Counties of California. Mr. Coughlin's recent trials include a RICO case against the tobacco industry (March 1999) and securities cases which went to trial against Wells Fargo (October 1999) and California Amplifier (February 2000).

JOHN J. STOIA, JR. received his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Tulsa in 1983. While working on his degree, Mr. Stoia was elected President of the National Political Science Honor Society and graduated with highest honors. In 1986, Mr. Stoia received his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Tulsa and graduated in the top of his class.

In 1987, Mr. Stoia graduated from the Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, D.C., receiving his Masters of Law in Securities Regulation. Thereafter, Mr. Stoia served as an enforcement attorney with the U.S.

Securities and Exchange Commission, until joining Milberg Weiss. Mr. Stoia was a partner with Milberg Weiss until co-founding Lerach Coughlin.

Mr. Stoia worked on numerous nationwide complex securities class actions, including *In re American Continental Corp./Lincoln Savings & Loan Sec. Litig.*, MDL 834 (D. Ariz.), which arose out of the collapse of Lincoln Savings & Loan and Charles Keating's empire. Mr. Stoia was a member of plaintiffs' trial team which obtained verdicts against Mr. Keating and his co-defendants in excess of \$3 billion and settlements of over \$240 million.

Mr. Stoia was involved in over 40 nationwide class actions brought by policyholders against U.S. and Canadian life insurance companies seeking redress for deceptive sales practices during the 1980s and 1990s. Mr. Stoia was actively involved in cases against, among others, Prudential, New York Life, Transamerica Life Insurance Company, General American Life Insurance Company, Manufacturer's Life, Metropolitan Life, American General, US Life, Allianz, Principal Life and Pacific Life Insurance Company. While at Milberg Weiss, Mr. Stoia was appointed lead counsel for plaintiffs and class members in all deceptive sales practices cases in which Milberg Weiss was involved.

Mr. Stoia was also involved in numerous cases brought against life insurance companies for racial discrimination involving the sale of small value or "industrial life" insurance policies during the 20th century. Mr. Stoia was lead counsel in *McNeil, et al. v. American General Life Insurance and Accident Insurance Company*, the first major settlement involving discrimination claims which resulted in a \$234 million recovery for class members. Mr. Stoia resolved other race-based insurance cases, including *Brown v. United Life*

Insurance Company (\$40 million), *Morris v. Life Insurance Company of Georgia* (\$55 million) and *Thompson v. Metropolitan Life* (\$145 million).

Mr. Stoia currently represents numerous large institutional investors who suffered hundreds of millions of dollars in losses as a result of the major financial scandals, including WorldCom and AOL-Time Warner.

Mr. Stoia is a frequent lecturer at ALI-ABA, Practicing Law Institute and American Trial Lawyers Association seminars and conferences.

PAUL J. GELLER received his Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from the University of Florida, where he was a member of the University Honors Program. Mr. Geller then earned his law degree, with Highest Honors, from Emory University School of Law. At Emory, Mr. Geller was an Editor of the Law Review, was inducted into the Order of the Coif legal honor society, and was awarded multiple American Jurisprudence Book Awards for earning the highest grade in the school in a dozen courses.

After spending several years representing blue chip companies in class action lawsuits at one of the largest corporate defense firms in the world, Mr. Geller was a founding partner and head of the Boca Raton offices of the national class action boutiques Cauley Geller Bowman & Rudman, LLP and Geller Rudman, PLLC. In June 2004, through a merger of Lerach Coughlin and Geller Rudman, PLLC, Mr. Geller opened the Boca Raton, Florida office of the Firm.

In July 2002, Mr. Geller was named by the *National Law Journal* as one of the nation's "40 Under 40" – an honor bestowed upon 40 of the country's top young litigators. In July 2003, Mr. Geller was featured in *Florida Trend* magazine

and the *South Florida Business Journal* as one of Florida's top lawyers.

Mr. Geller is rated AV by Martindale Hubbell (the highest rating available) and has served as Lead or Co-Lead counsel in a majority of the securities class actions that have been filed in the southeastern United States in the past several years, including cases against *Hamilton Bancorp* (\$8.5 million settlement), *Prison Realty Trust* (Co-Lead Derivative Counsel; total combined settlement of over \$120 million), and *Intermedia Corporation* (\$38 million settlement). Mr. Geller is currently one of the court-appointed Lead Counsel in cases involving the alleged manipulation of the asset value of some of the nation's largest mutual funds, including *Hicks v. Morgan Stanley & Co.*, Case No. 01 Civ. 10071 (S.D.N.Y.), *Abrams v. Van Kampen Funds, Inc.*, Case No. 01 C 7538 (N.D. Ill.), and *In re Eaton Vance Securities Litigation*, Case No. C.A. No. 01-10911 (D. Mass.). Mr. Geller is also heavily involved in corporate governance litigation. For example, Mr. Geller recently represented a shareholder of Applica, Inc. who was concerned with allegedly reckless acquisitions made by the company. Mr. Geller and his partners secured a settlement that required Applica to establish a new independent acquisitions committee charged with conducting due diligence and approving future acquisitions, even though such a committee is not required by SEC regulations. In another corporate governance lawsuit, Mr. Geller and his co-counsel challenged the independence of certain members of a special committee empaneled by Oracle Corp. to look into certain stock sales made by its Chairman and Chief Executive, Larry Ellison. After Delaware Chancery Court Vice Chancellor Leo E. Strine issued an order agreeing that the special committee was "fraught with conflicts," the *Wall Street Journal* called the decision "one of the most far-reaching ever on corporate governance."

Mr. Geller has also successfully represented consumers in class action litigation. He was personal counsel to the lead plaintiff in *Stoddard v. Advanta*, a case that challenged the adequacies of interest rate disclosures by one of the nation's largest credit card companies (\$11 million settlement) and was personal counsel to one of the lead plaintiffs in the American Family Publishers sweepstakes litigation, which alleged that the defendant misled consumers into thinking they would win a lottery if they purchased magazine subscriptions (\$38 million settlement).

During the past few years, several of Mr. Geller's cases have received regional and national press coverage. Mr. Geller has appeared on CNN's Headline News, CNN's Moneyline with Lou Dobbs, ABC, NBC and FOX network news programs. Mr. Geller is regularly quoted in the financial press, including the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Washington Post*, and *Business Week*.

Mr. Geller has been or is a member of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America, the Practicing Law Institute, the American Bar Association, the Palm Beach County Bar Association (former Member of Bar Grievance Committee) and the South Palm Beach County Bar Association (former Co-Chair of Pro Bono Committee).

SAMUEL H. RUDMAN received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from Binghamton University in 1989 and earned his juris doctorate from Brooklyn Law School in 1992. While at Brooklyn Law School, Mr. Rudman was a Dean's Merit Scholar and a member of the Brooklyn Journal of International Law and the Moot Court Honor Society.

Upon graduation from law school, Mr. Rudman joined the Enforcement Division of the United States Securities & Exchange Commission in its New York Regional Office as a staff attorney. In his position as a staff attorney, Mr. Rudman was responsible for numerous investigations and prosecutions of violations of the federal securities laws. Thereafter, Mr. Rudman joined one of the largest corporate law firms in the country, where he represented public companies in the defense of securities class actions and also handled several white collar criminal defense matters.

Shortly after the passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, Mr. Rudman joined the firm of Milberg Weiss, where he was one of the youngest lawyers ever to be made a partner at the firm and was responsible for the investigation and initiation of securities and shareholder class actions. In addition, Mr. Rudman developed an expertise in the area of lead plaintiff jurisprudence and has been responsible for numerous reported decisions in that area of securities law.

Mr. Rudman continues to focus his practice in the area of investigating and initiating securities and shareholder class actions and also devotes a considerable amount of time to representing clients in ongoing securities litigation.

DARREN J. ROBBINS received his Bachelor of Science and Master of Arts degrees in Economics from the University of Southern California. Mr. Robbins received his J.D. degree from Vanderbilt Law School, where he served as the Managing Editor of the *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*.

Mr. Robbins oversees Lerach Coughlin's merger and acquisition practice. Mr. Robbins has extensive experience in federal and state securities class action litigation. Mr. Robbins

served as one of the lead counsel in the *In re Prison Realty Sec. Litig.* (\$120+ million recovery), *In re Dollar General Sec. Litig.* (\$172.5 million recovery) and *Pirelli Armstrong Tire Corp. Retiree Medical Benefits Trust v. Hanover Compressor Co.* (\$85+ million recovery). Mr. Robbins currently represents institutional and individual investors in securities actions in state and federal courts across the country, including The Regents of the University of California in the *Enron* litigation and numerous public pension funds in the *WorldCom* bond litigation.

Mr. Robbins is a frequent speaker at conferences and seminars concerning securities matters and shareholder litigation across the country.

KEITH F. PARK graduated from the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1968 and from the Hastings College of Law of the University of California in 1972.

Mr. Park is responsible for the recoveries in more than 1,000 securities class actions, including actions involving: Dollar General (\$162 million recovery); Mattel (\$122 million recovery); Prison Realty (\$105 million recovery); Honeywell (in addition to the \$100 million recovery, obtained Honeywell's agreement to adopt significant corporate governance changes relating to compensation of senior executives and directors, stock trading by directors, executive officers and key employees, internal and external audit functions, and financial reporting and board independence); Sprint (in addition to \$50 million recovery, obtained important governance enhancements, including creation of "Lead Independent Director" and expensing of stock options); Hanover Compressor (on top of \$85 million recovery, obtained the following governance enhancements, among others: direct shareholder nomination of Board and mandatory rotation of audit firm); 3COM (\$259 million recovery); Chiron (\$43 million recovery); MedPartners (\$56 million recovery); NME (\$60.75 million recovery); and TCI (\$26.5 million recovery).

He is admitted to practice in California and New York. He is admitted to practice in California and New York.

HELEN J. HODGES received her Bachelor of Science degree in accounting from Oklahoma State University in 1979. While attending Oklahoma State, Ms. Hodges obtained her private pilot's license and in 1980 was a member of Oklahoma State's flying team, which won top honors at the National Intercollegiate Flying Association competition. Ms. Hodges became a

certified public accountant in 1982 and received her Juris Doctor degree from the University of Oklahoma in 1983, where she was the Managing Editor of the Law Review. She was admitted to the State Bars of Oklahoma in 1983 and California in 1987.

Before partnership with Lerach Coughlin, Ms. Hodges was a partner with Milberg Weiss. Formerly, she was staff accountant with Arthur Andersen & Co. and served as the law clerk for the *Penn Square* cases in the Western District of Oklahoma. Ms. Hodges has been involved in numerous securities class actions, including *Knapp v. Gomez*, Civ. No. 87-0067-H(M) (S.D. Cal.), in which a plaintiffs' verdict was returned in a Rule 10b-5 class action; *National Health Labs*, which was settled for \$64 million; and *Thurber v. Mattel*, which was settled for \$122 million.

REED R. KATHREIN, prior to his partnership with Lerach Coughlin, was partner of the San Francisco office of Milberg Weiss, which he opened in 1994. For the past 15 years, he has focused his practice on complex and class action litigation, principally involving securities or consumer fraud. He was lead counsel in numerous state as well as federal court actions around the country, including co-lead counsel in the *In re 3Com Sec. Litig.* which settled for \$259 million.

Mr. Kathrein publishes and lectures extensively in the fields of litigation, consumer and securities law, class actions, and international law. He annually co-chairs the Executive Enterprises program for corporate officers and counsel entitled, "Dealing With Analysts and the Press." He has spoken to the American Bar Association (ABA), the American Business Trial Lawyers Association (ABTLA), the Consumer Attorneys of California (CAOC), the Practising Law Institute (PLI), the Securities Law Institute, the National

Investor Relations Institute (NIRI), state and local bar groups, private seminar organizations and corporations. He testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on behalf of the American Bar Association in favor of advice and consent to ratification of treaties on international sales, arbitration, evidence and service of process. He testified before the California Assembly and Senate Committees on Y2K litigation, the unfair trade practice act and changes in the business judgment rule. He actively fought the passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (PSLRA) and the Securities Litigation Uniform Standard Act of 1998. Most recently, he worked behind the scenes to shape the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 on corporate responsibility and accountability.

He served as chairman of the Private International Law Committee of the American Bar Association from 1984-1990, as a director and officer of the International Business Counsel Mid-America from 1983-1988, where he also chaired the policy committee. He acted as an advisor to the U.S. State Department's Advisory Committee on Private International Law from 1984-1990. He is a member of the executive committee of the National Association of Securities and Commercial Law Attorneys (NASCAT), and since 1998 has been a member of the Board of Governors of the Consumer Attorneys of California (CAOC).

Formerly, Mr. Kathrein was a partner in the Chicago law firm Arnstein & Lehr, where he represented national and international corporations in litigation involving antitrust, commercial, toxic tort, employment and product and public liability disputes. Mr. Kathrein graduated from the University of Miami (B.A. *cum laude*, 1974; J.D. 1977) where he served as Editor-in-Chief of the *International Law Journal*.

He is admitted to the Bar of the States of Illinois (1977), Florida (1978) and California (1989).

ERIC ALAN ISAACSON received his A.B. *summa cum laude* from Ohio University in 1982. He earned his J.D. with high honors from the Duke University School of Law in 1985 and was elected to the Order of the Coif. Mr. Isaacson served as a Note and Comment Editor for the *Duke Law Journal*, and in his third year of law school became a member of the moot court board. After graduation Mr. Isaacson clerked for the Honorable J. Clifford Wallace of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

In 1986, Mr. Isaacson joined the litigation department of O'Melveny & Myers, where his practice included cases involving allegations of trademark infringement, unfair business practices and securities fraud. He served as a member of the trial team that successfully prosecuted a major trademark-infringement action.

Prior to his partnership at Lerach Coughlin, Mr. Isaacson was a partner at Milberg Weiss, where he took part in prosecuting many securities-fraud class actions. He was a member of the plaintiffs' trial team in *In re Apple Computer Sec. Litig.*, No. C 84-20198(A)-JW (N.D. Cal.), for example.

Since the early 1990s, his practice has focused on appellate matters in cases before the California Courts of Appeal, the California Supreme Court, the United States Court of Appeals and the United States Supreme Court. *See, e.g., Lone Star Ladies Investment Club v. Schlotzsky's Inc.*, 238 F.3d 363 (5th Cir. 2001); *Hertzberg v. Dignity Partners, Inc.*, 191 F.3d 1076 (9th Cir. 1999); *Warsaw v. Xoma Corp.*, 74 F.3d 955 (9th Cir. 1996); *Fecht v. Price Co.*, 70 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 1995); *Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*, 7 Cal. 4th 1057 (1994).

Mr. Isaacson's publications include: "Pleading Scierter Under Section 21D(b)(2) of the Securities

Exchange Act of 1934: Motive, Opportunity, Recklessness and the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995" (co-authored with William S. Lerach), 33 San Diego Law Review 893 (1996); "Securities Class Actions in the United States" (co-authored with Patrick J. Coughlin), in William G. Horton & Gerhard Wegen, editors, *Litigation Issues in the Distribution of Securities: An International Perspective* 399 (Kluwer International/International Bar Association, 1997); "Pleading Standards Under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995: The Central District of California's *Chantal* Decision" (co-authored with Alan Schulman & Jennifer Wells), *Class Action & Derivative Suits*, Summer 1996, at 14; "Commencing Litigation Under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995" (co-authored with Patrick J. Coughlin), in Jay B. Kasner & Bruce G. Vanyo, editors, *Securities Litigation* 1996 9-22 (Practising Law Institute 1996); "The Flag Burning Issue: A Legal Analysis and Comment," 23 Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review 535 (1990).

Mr. Isaacson has received recognition for his *pro bono* work from the California Star Bar and the San Diego Volunteer Lawyer Program. He has served as a member of the Board of Directors of the San Diego Foundation for Change since January of 2004.

Mr. Isaacson has been a member of the California Bar since 1985. He also is admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court, the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Circuits, and before all federal district courts in the State of California.

MARK SOLOMON is a partner at Lerach Coughlin. Prior to joining Lerach Coughlin, Mr. Solomon was a partner at Milberg Weiss Bershad Hynes & Lerach LLP. He earned his law degrees from

Trinity College, Cambridge University, England (1985), Harvard Law School (1986) and the Inns of Court School of Law, England (1987). He is admitted to the bars of England and Wales (Barrister), Ohio and California, as well as to various U.S. Federal District and Appellate Courts.

Before attending Trinity College in England, Mr. Solomon served as a British police officer. After qualifying as a barrister, and prior to joining Milberg Weiss in September 1993, he practiced at the international firm Jones Day Reavis & Pogue in Cleveland, Ohio followed by practice at the Los Angeles office of New York's Stroock & Stroock & Lavan. At those firms Mr. Solomon's representations included the defense of securities fraud and other white-collar crimes, antitrust, copyright, commercial and real estate litigation and reinsurance arbitration. While practicing in Los Angeles, Mr. Solomon took to trial, and won, complex commercial contract and real estate actions in respectively, the Orange County and Los Angeles Superior Courts.

Since 1993, Mr. Solomon has spearheaded the prosecution of many significant cases. He has obtained substantial recoveries and judgments through settlement, summary adjudications and trial. He litigated, through trial, *In re Helionetics*, No. SACV-94-1069-AHS(EEEx) (C.D. Cal.), where he and his trial partner, Paul Howes, won a unanimous \$15.4 million jury verdict in November 2000. He has led the litigation of many other cases, among them *In re Informix Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. C-97-1289-CRB (N.D. Cal.) (\$142 million recovery); *Rosen, et al. v. Macromedia, Inc., et al.*, No. 988526 (Cal. Super.Ct., County of San Francisco) (\$48 million recovery); *In re Community Psychiatric Centers Sec. Litig.*, No. SACV-91-533-AHS(EEEx) (C.D. Cal.) (\$42.5 million recovery); *In re Advanced Micro Devices Sec. Litig.*, No. C-93-20662-RPA(PVT) (N.D. Cal.) (\$34